Self-Financing Scheme built by the Delhi Development Authority so far;

(b) the number of these flats allotted to the registered persons eligible under the rules for Self-Financing Scheme;

(c) the total number of other persons who were not entitled for allotment of flats under the rules for Self-Financial Scheme, but were allotted flats as a special case during the last three years; and

(d) the total number of persons at present registered for allotment of flats under the Self-Financing Scheme?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI DALBIR SINGH): (a) 14,958 flats have been built upto 1985-86.

(b) 12,417.

(c) 40 persons were allotted SFS flats on out of turn basis.

(d) 56,568.

Tender inquiry for Hearing AIDS

1683. SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Will the Minister of WELFARE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received and complaint of irregularities regarding a tender inquiry for the supply of hearing aids from the Electronic Industries Association, Bombay, in the month of April, 1986; and

(b) if so, what were the irregularities pointed out and what steps were taken in this regard?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF WELFARE (SHRI GIRDHAR GOMANGO): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) A copy of the complaint along with the report on the action taken on the complaint is given in the enclosed statement.

Statement

Sub: *Tender inquiry No. 4-56/85-SWI dated 18.2.86 for supply of Hearing Aid.*

Some of our members, manufacturing hearing aids, have brought to our notice a few points relating to the offers opened against the above tender enquiry on 14th March '86 and relevant action on the same thereafter. We reproduce them for your perusal and necessary action. We shall be grateful to receive your comments and clarifications on the same at the earliest.

Irregularities in tenders submitted:

I. Out of the ten tenders opened, one tender from PEICO/PHILIPS was opened under unusual conditions viz. as per the specific requirements of the tender, neither the tender opening date nor the tender number was indicated on the envelope. We understand that this is a statutory condition for all sealed tenders. We also feel that this tender should not have been opened as it was without the date and tender number.

II. The letter dated 18th February 1986 from the Social Welfare had indicated that the application for ISI branding should be submitted prior to 15th February 1986, which is post-factum.

A prior letter from the Ministry of Welfare had indicated that applications for ISI marking should be submitted before 15th January, 1986.

III. Whereas all tenders had made such an application before the specified date of 15th January, 1986, only one tenders M/s. PFICO|PHILIPS had enclosed a receipt (also not in their name) for ISI branding on 15th February, 1986. This information of late submission was disclosed during the tender opening.

IV. *Prima facie* it would appear that the extension of the date for ISI application to 15th February, 1986, was to accomodate the late submission by PEICO|PHILIPS, (but also not in their name).

V. We would also like to draw your attention that whereas the conditions in the tender specified that the tenderers (not their agents) should apply for the ISI marking, it appears that some organsiation by the name of MENEZES ELECTRONICS PVT. LTD. of R49 Duram, Panjim, Goa, had made an application and was annexed to the PEICO/PHILIPS quotation. This is completely contrary to the conditions of the tender which clearly specifies "Tenderer must have applied to the ISI.... .....proof of this should be enclosed with the tender....."

VI. It is evident that M/s. MENEZES ELECTRONICS of GOA, manufactures these hearing aids.

VII. A recent High Court ruling has decreed that PEICO is not permitted or authorised to use the trade name' 'PHILIPS' and on articles not made by PHILIPS as this amount to "passing off" However, during the reading of the tender, PEICO has quoted for PHILIPS Hearing aids, which amounts to "Passing-Off."

Extension of 1985-86 *Rate Contract till* 13-3-1987:

We have also been advised that vide your letter dated 28th March, '86 you have proposed to extend the rate contract for supply of hearing aids finalised for 1985-86 for one year and have requested the hearing aids manufactures to confirm, whether they would be willing to supply the hearing aids till 31.3.87 at the same rate. Our above members consider your aforesaid request unjustifiable after calling tenders afresh for the current year. They are of the view that your above action may be with an idea to exclude our such members who have quoted for the first time. It is regretted that you did not ponder over these specific facts of prime importance before proposing to keep the contractual prices for 1985-86 in tact till 31.3.87!

Report on the action taken on the complaint.

The complaint was examined. As in the past, tenders for hearing aids were invited for 1986-87 from all manufacturers and suppliers (who may not be manufacturers). There were no irregularities in the rseceipt and opening of the tenders. There was also no irregularity in extending the last year's contract.

Allocation of Advertising time by Doordarshan

1684. DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI: Will the Minister of INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Doordarshan has allocated advertising time to several advertising agencies;

(b) if so, the names of these advertising agencies, the time allocated and the rates payable, agency-wise, during the year 1985-86 and till June, 1986; and

(c) whether these advertising agencies sell television time at an exorbitant price in the market?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI V. N. GADGIL): (a) So far as spot advertisements are concerned, no advertising time is allocated to agencies as such. The agencies are free to book their advertisements at a particular time of their choice provided the time is available. However, Doordarshan does allocate sponsorship of programmes to advertising agencies.

(b) A statement indicating allocation of sponsorship of Doordarshan programmes to advertising agencies during 1985 and 1986 (till June) is attached at Annexure-I. [*See* Appendix CXXXIX Annexure No. 98.] A copy of the rate card on the basis of which payments are made to Doordarsan by sponsors is attached at Annexure-II. [*See* Appendix CXXXIX, Annexure No. 99.]

(c) Government has no information whether the agencies sell allocated programmes at an exorbitant price.